

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION THREE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

CLAUDIA NAVARRETE et al.,

Defendants and Appellants.

B260184

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. BA416700)

APPEAL from judgments of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,
Ronald S. Coen, Judge. Affirmed.

Heather E. Shallenberger, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for
Defendant and Appellant Claudia Navarrete.

Michele A. Douglass, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant
and Appellant Hector Sanchez.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Following a jury trial, defendants and appellants, Claudia Navarrete and Hector Sanchez, were found guilty of manufacturing, selling, or possessing for sale a counterfeit registered mark (Pen. Code, § 350, subd. (a)(2)). Each defendant was sentenced to a term of 16 months in county jail. We affirm.

FACTUAL SUMMARY

Viewed in accordance with the usual rules of appellate review (*People v. Ochoa* (1993) 6 Cal.4th 1199, 1206), the evidence established the following.

Corey Ward, an undercover investigator employed by a private company, Investigative Consultants, had been trained by various high fashion brand firms (Louis Vuitton, Gucci, etc.) to detect counterfeit versions of their products. During February, April and June 2013, Ward purchased a variety of handbags and wallets at a small store on South Maple Street in Los Angeles. Ward believed this merchandise was counterfeit. The items were sold to him by defendant Navarrete, who acknowledged they were pretty good replicas and said she did not sell to people she does not know because she did not want to get into trouble. Navarrete retrieved the items from a black plastic bag that was kept behind a display case. Ward covertly filmed these transactions. Ward was given a business card that displayed the store name, “Handbags Wholesale and Retail,” and listed two names: Claudia and Hector.

Sacha Vafaeisefat worked for Investigative Consultants and had testified numerous times as an expert on counterfeiting. Vafaeisefat accompanied the police when they executed a search warrant at defendants’ store on August 29, 2013, and he acted as the custodian for merchandise the police seized. Vafaeisefat determined that all the items seized were counterfeit versions of products designed and sold by such companies as Burberry, Chanel, Gucci, Louis Vuitton, Michael Kors, Prada and Tory Burch. Vafaeisefat’s employer acted as a representative for these companies, and he testified the companies had all filed patents on their trademarks with the United States Patent and Trade Office. A total of 470 counterfeit items were seized, which Vafaeisefat testified had a street value of \$18,000, whereas the retail price for authentic versions would have been about \$200,000.

Los Angeles Police Officer Manuel Alvarez assisted with executing the search warrant at the store. Navarrete told him that defendant Sanchez was her common-law husband. Sanchez told Alvarez he was the business owner and that he had been selling counterfeit items for about two years. Sanchez said he purchased counterfeit brand emblems from an unknown man who would show up at the store and sell them to him. Sanchez would then affix these emblems to the merchandise.

Defendants did not present any evidence. Each defendant filed a timely notice of appeal following judgment and sentencing.

We appointed counsel to represent each defendant on appeal. After reviewing the record, both attorneys filed opening briefs requesting this court to independently review the record pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441. We directed counsel to send the record on appeal and a copy of the opening briefs to defendants, notifying them that they had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues they wished us to consider. Neither defendant has filed a supplemental brief.

DISCUSSION

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied appellate counsel have fully complied with their responsibilities and that no arguable appellate issues exist. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 278 [120 S.Ct. 746]; *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 443.)

DISPOSITION

The judgments are affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

EDMON, P. J.

We concur:

KITCHING, J.

ALDRICH, J.